



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,464	10/31/2001	Michael J. Wolt	41983/KMO/C927	1887

23363 7590 02/04/2003
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP
350 WEST COLORADO BOULEVARD
SUITE 500
PASADENA, CA 91105

EXAMINER

TRAN LIEN, THUY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1761

DATE MAILED: 02/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/001,464

Applicant(s)

Wolt et al.

Examiner

Lien Tran

Art Unit

1761



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct. 31, 2001
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 2
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1761

1. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, what does applicant mean by “.8 wt% on a 425 moisture basis” and “.2wt% on a 42% moisture basis”?

Claims 14-17 and 27 have the same problem as claim 1.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459

(1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
4. Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudel in view of Gilles et al.

Art Unit: 1761

Rudel discloses a composition comprising of milled oat groat product and high gluten wheat flour. The composition may also contain one or more diluents of other natural grain products. The composition is used to make both yeast and chemically leavened baked goods such as bread, bagel, pizza, muffins etc... The composition comprises gluten flour to produce a vital gluten content of at 17% and a milled oat groat product to produce a soluble oat dietary fiber content of from .2-56% of the vital gluten content of the dry mix. Vegetable gum such as guar gum is used in amount of .5-3.5% of the dry mix. Baking flours such as wheat, whole wheat, rye, corn or bran flours or combinations thereof may be used. Flavoring agents such as onion powder, caraway seeds, salt and brown sugar can be added in making bread. Bread loaves are made from doughs prepared by the addition of salt, yeast nutrient, yeast and water to various flour mixes (See columns 11,13,14,20 and 22)

Rudel does not disclose the soluble fiber content and the amount of soluble fiber as claimed, the sources of soluble fiber of claims 10, 12,28,37, the size of the grain, nuts or seed component, the addition of soy protein, the glycemic index and the density as claimed.

Gilles et al disclose a diabetic nutritions which incorporate dietary fibers. They disclose the use of many different types of fiber. (See column 9)

The bread product disclosed by Rudel contains both grain/seed source soluble fiber and processed source soluble fiber because it contains guar gum and soluble oat dietary fiber; it also has beta glucan because the fiber is obtained from oat. The amount of fiber and the fiber content are not the same as claimed; however, such variation would have been obvious to one skilled in

Art Unit: 1761

the art because it would have been obvious to add more fiber materials when it is desired to obtain a higher fiber content in the final product. It is not clear what is meant by on a 42% moisture basis; if this refer to the water content of the product, then the water content varies with different types of bread product and it would have been within the skill of one in the art to determine the water content depending on the type of bread made. Rudel discloses caraway seeds can be added for flavoring. The size of the seed depends on the texture desired. It would have been obvious to grind the seeds to various size depending on the texture wanted. For example, if a coarse texture is desired, it would have been obvious to use large particles or if a fine texture is desired, then it would have been obvious to use smaller particles. It would also have been obvious to use other seeds or nut or grain for flavoring depending on the flavor and the type of bread being made. It would also have been obvious to add soy protein if it is desired to enhance the protein content of the product; this is well known in the art. The size of the protein particle depends on the texture desired and this can readily be determined by one skilled in the art. It would also have been obvious to use whole wheat flour in various amount if whole wheat bread is wanted. It would also have been obvious to select the soluble fiber from various sources; all the claimed fiber sources are known in the art as shown by Gilles et al. The selection of specific type depends on the flavor and taste desired. The density of the bread varies with the type of bread and the texture wanted. For example if a dense bread is desired, then it would have been obvious to vary the ingredients to increase the density; determining the density that is appropriate to the bread product to produce the most optimum eating quality would have been within the skill of one

Art Unit: 1761

in the art through routine experimentation. It would also have been obvious to formulate the bread to have different glycemic index by controlling ingredients such as carbohydrate, the type of flour and the amount of fiber depending on the intended use of the product. If the product is intended to not cause a significant rise in the sugar level after consumption, it would have been obvious to formulate a bread having low glycemic index.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Murphy et al disclose a process for preparing baked goods containing fibers and hydrocolloids.

Katta et al disclose composition related to low glycemic index foods.

Pullinen discloses foods products containing beta-glucan enriched fiber.

6. US application no. 09/613664 and the office action, amendment and response of the application cited on the IDS were not considered because they are not published prior art and thus should not be cited on the IDS.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lien Tran whose telephone number is 703-308-1868. The examiner can normally be reached on Wed-Fri. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9310.

Application/Control Number: 10/001464

Page 6

Art Unit: 1761

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

January 24, 2003

Lien Tran
LIEN TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Group 1700